

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,010 to Kwon et al.

Claims 7 and 8 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

A Revocation and Power of Attorney Appointment of New Agent, Change of Correspondence Address and Attorney Docket Number is submitted concurrently.

Claims 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are presently pending and 11-21 are withdrawn from consideration.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,010 to Kwon et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as being based on a reference that neither describes nor suggests the novel combination of features now recited in independent claim 1, as amended. For example, independent claim 1 now recite, amongst other features, "the neck region is completely covered with the drain electrode such that both sides of the neck region are disposed within boundaries of the drain electrode." Support for

this amendment can be found, for example, in FIG. 7 and paragraph [0050] of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwon et al. fails to teach or suggest a neck region is completely covered with the drain electrode such that both sides of the neck region are disposed within boundaries of the drain electrode. In contrast to the presently claimed invention, a left side of the active layer 116 in FIG. 6i of Kwon et al. is disposed outside of the drain electrode 114. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Kwon et al. does not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 1, as amended.

For at least the above reasons, Kwon et al. fails to describe or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 1, as amended. Moreover, Applicants also respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-6, 9 and 10 are allowable at least because of their dependency on amended independent claim 1, and for the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-6, 9 and 10 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request the entry of this Amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal.

Applicants also request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 08-1641. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

HELLER EHRMAN, LLP

June 23, 2005  
Date

Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Patent Agent  
Reg. No. 47,256

Customer No. 26633  
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: 202-912-2000  
Facsimile: 202-912-2020